

REMARKS

In the Office Action, claims 2-4, 6-8, 10-12, and 14-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. ¶112, first paragraph. In response to the Patent Office's position, Applicants respectfully refer the Patent Office to pages 6 and 7 of Applicants' specification as an example for support of the claim terms allegedly at issue. Therefore, Applicants believe that this rejection should be withdrawn.

Further, the claims were rejected as allegedly anticipated or obvious in view of the cited art. In support of this position, the Patent Office concedes that the claimed range with respect to the average diameter of the projection does not overlap what is disclosed in the cited art. See, for example, Office Action, page 4. Yet, the Patent Office still maintains the rejections.

Applicants believe that this position is improper. Indeed, Applicants have demonstrated the critical nature of the claimed projection range as demonstrated in Table 3 and the corresponding written description of Applicant's specification. The beneficial effects (e.g., capacity retention ratio) are further enhanced within the claimed range of 3 microns to 5 microns as further defined in newly added dependent claims 20 and 21. Therefore, Applicants do not believe that the cited art equates to an obvious modification of the claimed invention for at least these reasons.

Accordingly, Applicants believe that the anticipation and obviousness rejections should be withdrawn and thus respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

K&L GATES LLP

BY 

Thomas C. Basso
Reg. No. 46,541
Customer No. 29175

Dated: October 22, 2009